Vanzolini, P.E. 1986. Addenda and corrigenda to the *Catalogue of Neotropical Squamata. Smithsonian Herpetological Service*, **70**: 1–25.

(2) Hobart M. Smith

Department of Environmental, Population and Organismic Biology,
University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309–0334, U.S.A.

Edwin L. Bell

Department of Biology, Albright College, Reading, Pennsylvania 19612–5234, U.S.A.

Neither of us is an expert in the taxonomy of South American lizards; in the taxonomic placement of *Tropidolepis bellii* Gray, 1831 we were merely following literature allocation. Inasmuch as Dr Etheridge is an expert in the field, we would not contest his allocation of the name (his comment above).

Our involvement in the names pertaining to this case is a product of accounting for all the species-group names proposed in or applicable to the genus *Sceloporus* Wiegmann, 1828, a project that we have been working on for several years. A number of such names were at one time proposed in the nominal genus *Tropidolepis* Cuvier, 1829, hence our concern with these (para. 1 of the application). Their proper allocation had to be established.

With regard to *Liolaemus bellii* Gray, 1845, although stability of nomenclature in the sense of established usage cannot be viewed as at stake, in another sense stability is involved: the proper interpretation of the fact that Ortiz's dissertation was not published. Nuñez & Jaksic (1992) regarded Ortiz's synonymizing of *altissimus* with *bellii* as invalid because it was never published. Nevertheless, as pointed out by Etheridge above, several authors in several works have accepted Ortiz's conclusion. It would help nomenclatural stability considerably if the Commission would make it clear that a decision on the proper name for the species concerned cannot hinge on the failure of Ortiz's dissertation to be published; his conclusion was published subsequently by others. We support the placement of the specific name of *Liolaemus bellii* Gray, 1845 on the Official List.

Comments on the proposed conservation of usage of 15 mammal specific names based on wild species which are antedated by or contemporary with those based on domestic animals

(Case 3010; see BZN **53**: 28–37, 125, 192–200, 286–288)

(1) Robin Pellew

World Wide Fund for Nature, WWF-UK, Panda House, Weyside Park,
Catteshall Lane, Godalming, Surrey GU7 1XR, U.K.

I write as Director of WWF-UK.

I support the proposal to conserve the 15 mammal specific names for wild species which are cited in this application. Stability in the nomenclature is a prerequisite of conservation and for this reason I urge that confirmation be given to the majority usage by adoption of the first available specific name based on a wild population for the 15 species.

(2) Elizabeth Cary Mungall

Department of Biology, Texas Woman's University, Denton, Texas 76204, U.S.A. (presently at *7926 South Lagoon Drive, Panama City Beach, Florida 32408-5306, U.S.A.*)

I support the application by Gentry, Clutton-Brock & Groves to conserve the usage of 15 mammal specific names based on wild species but antedated by, or contemporary with, names based on domestic animals assumed to be their derivatives. Among the advantages pointed out by the authors, this adoption of the first available specific name based on a wild population would confirm majority usage. Although most wild taxa and their domestic counterparts have the same scientific name (for example, *Oryctolagus cuniculus* (Linnaeus, 1758) for the wild and domestic rabbit, and *Columba livia* Gmelin, 1789 for the rock dove and domestic pigeon) a few, including these 15, traditionally do not.

Both stability in nomenclature and different scientific names for related wild and domestic forms are distinct advantages for investigators like myself who engage in ethological studies. Ethology is a comparative science. As works by leaders in this field, such as ungulate specialist Fritz R. Walther, illustrate (e.g. Walther, 1974, 1979, 1984), wild species and domestic forms are studied and discussed on equal terms. This promotes inspection of relationships in which domestication is not the central issue at the same time that it facilitates discussions on the process of domestication and its effects. Thus, Walther (1984) used wild American bison *Bison bison* (Linnaeus, 1758) and Marco Polo sheep *Ovis ammon poli* Blyth, 1841 and domestic Camargue cattle *Bos taurus* Linnaeus, 1758 as examples in a discussion of scraping the ground. Swiss zoo director Heini Hediger included the extinct aurochs *Bos primigenius* Bojanus, 1827, European bison *Bison bonasus* (Linnaeus, 1758) and domestic cattle *Bos taurus* among sets of wild and domestic forms used as examples in discussions of domestication and its effects (Hediger, 1964, 1968, 1969). Cases like these, in which clear distinction between the wild and domestic forms is critically important, are inherent in ethology. No matter which fashion in naming domestic animals is currently being followed, minimizing confusion over which form is meant will promote useful discussion.

Applied ethology also benefits from retaining the traditionally separate names set out in the application. A distinction between wild and domestic forms helps to reduce confusion when animal owners request advice. Is it the wild or the domestic form which is referred to? What management options would be most appropriate? This is not just a question involving zoo personnel or those in the pet trade. In addition to import and export regulations, I have been especially aware of this need for clarity among owners of ungulates of foreign origin kept on ranches in the Americas (see Mungall & Sheffield, 1994). Ranches raising 'exotics' of this sort are most prevalent in the state of Texas in the U.S.A. There, the latest state census (see Mungall, 1994) estimated 182,008 head of foreign wildlife, including the wild bezoar goat *Capra aegagrus* Erxleben, 1777 and the guanaco *Lama guanicoe* (Müller, [1776]), and domestics such as the llama *Lama glama* (Linnaeus, 1758) and alpaca *Lama pacos* (Linnaeus, 1758). When questions arise concerning, for example, camel, gaur, water buffalo, mouflon, goat or sheep, the first task is to define which animal is actually under discussion, since representatives of all these – some wild and some domestic – have been kept. Ranchers take the distinctions between wild and domestic forms more seriously when the scientific names are distinct. Separate names encourage owners to keep separate records and to avoid interbreeding, unless hybridization is an intentional goal (see Mungall & Sheffield, 1994). This distinction has far-reaching consequences – ever since the Indian blackbuck *Antilope cervicapra* (Linnaeus, 1758) led the way with repeated shipments back to native habitat in Pakistan, Texas ranch populations have been looked upon by many exotic breeders as potential reservoirs for restocking efforts to rebuild wild populations.

Therefore, I consider that ethology, both pure and applied, is among the disciplines which would be best served by retention of separate names for wild and domestic forms. As a first step, approval by the Commission of the names for wild species will be most welcome, ensuring that there is a clear ruling to follow.

Additional references

Hediger, H. 1964. *Wild animals in captivity*. x, 207 pp. Dover Publications, New York. (Translated by G. Sircom).

Hediger, H. 1968. *The psychology and behaviour of animals in zoos and circuses*. viii, 166 pp. Dover Publications, New York. (Translated by G. Sircom).

Hediger, H. 1969. *Man and animal in the zoo: zoo biology*. iv, 303 pp. Lawrence/Delacorte Press, New York. (Translated by G. Vevers & W. Reade).

Mungall, E.C. 1994. Texotics tables – census numbers. *The Fence Line*. 4(6): 14–15.

Mungall, E.C. & Sheffield, W.J. 1994. *Exotics on the range: the Texas example*. xii, 256 pp. Texas A & M University Press, College Station.

Walther, F.R. 1974. Some reflections on expressive behaviour in combats and courtship of certain horned ungulates. Pp. 56–106 *in* Geist, V. & Walther, F.R. (Eds.), *The behaviour of ungulates and its relation to management*, vol. 1. 511 pp. IUCN Publications, n.s., no. 24. Morges, Switzerland.

Walther, F.R. 1979. Das Verhalten der Hornträger (Bovidae). *Handbuch der Zoologie*, **8**(10, 30): 1–184.

Walther, F.R. 1984. *Communication and expression in hoofed mammals*. xxii, 423 pp. Indiana University Press, Bloomington.

(3) Andrea Sforzi

Museo Civico di Storia Naturale, via G. Mazzini 61, 58100 Grosseto, Italy

This application is without any doubt necessary and worthwhile. The authors have finally succeeded in filling an important gap, concerning the nomenclature of 15 wild mammal species with domestic derivatives, which first became apparent 25 years ago (Groves's original application to the Commission, published in BZN **27**: 269–272, March 1971).

The problem of setting out precise rules to deal with the names for wild species which are distinct from, and are contemporary or postdate, those for related domestic animals, has never been solved. The specific names based on wild populations are not protected at the moment against earlier names based on domestic forms which might be considered to be synonyms, and under the Code these latter should have precedence. Linnaeus's (1758, 1766) names for domestic forms have been applied to the wild species by a few authors, resulting in ambiguity and considerable confusion.

The Code urges stability in names and the solution proposed in the application for the names for wild species is the most up-to-date and appropriate in terms of current usage. The proposed names are in accord with those adopted by most authors.

I have been working on the European wildcat for more than nine years and am still active in field research relating to its biology and conservation in Italy and some islands of the Mediterranean rim. With Prof B. Ragni of Perugia University I am also beginning a new genetic revision of Italian cat populations. Ragni & Randi (1986) have previously published on wildcat systematics, and Randi & Ragni (1991) on genetics.

The proposal in the application that the European wildcat should be called *Felis silvestris* Schreber, [1777] (and not *Felis catus*, which was Linnaeus's 1758 name for the domestic cat) is in my view completely correct, and its approval by the Commission will at last give a definitive and acceptable ruling. Although most of the authors working on wildcats (see, for example, Miller, 1912; Pocock, 1951; Suminski, 1962; Shauenberg, 1969; Kratochvil, 1976; Corbet & Ovenden, 1980; Nowak & Paradiso, 1983; Ragni & Randi, 1986; Corbet & Hill, 1991; Hemmer, 1991; Kitchener, 1991; Wilson & Reeder (Eds.), 1993; Hausser (Ed.), 1995; Ragni et al., 1995; and Nowell & Jackson, 1996) have adopted *silvestris*, the absence of an official ruling has sometimes led to confusion. Approval will ensure that this will not arise in the future.

Additional references

Corbet, G.B. & Ovenden, D. 1980. *The Mammals of Britain and Europe*. Collins, London.

Hausser, J. (Ed.) 1995. *Säugetiere der Schweiz*. Birkhäuser, Basel.

Hemmer, K. 1991. Gattung *Felis* (L. 1758). *In* Niethammer, J. & Krapp, F., *Handbuch der Säugetiere Europas*, Band 5, Teil 2. Aula-Verlag, Wiesbaden.

Kitchener, A. 1991. *The natural history of the wild cats*. Helm, London.

Kratochvil, Z. 1976. Volume of the neurocranium in relation to the craniological criteria in *Felis silvestris*, *F. lybica* and *F. catus*. *Zoologické Listy*, **25**: 117–128. [In German].

Miller, G.S. 1912. *Catalogue of the mammals of Western Europe*. London.

Nowak, R.M. & Paradiso, J.L. 1983. *Walker's mammals of the world*. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.

Nowell, K. & Jackson P. 1996. *Wild cats. Status survey and conservation action plan.* IUCN/SSC Cat Specialist Group. Gland, Switzerland.

Pocock, R.I. 1951. *Catalogue of the genus* Felis. British Museum (Natural History), London.

Ragni, B. & Randi, E. 1986. Multivariate analysis of craniometric characters in European wild cat, domestic cat, and African wild cat (genus *Felis*). *Zeitschrift für Säugetierkunde*, **51**: 243–251.

Ragni, B., Randi, E., Sforzi, A., Masseti, M. & Possenti, M. 1995. *Biogeography and systematics of the wildcat: the Italian samples*. Unpublished report. 2nd European Congress of Mammalogy. Southampton, 27 March–1 April 1995.

Randi, E. & Ragni, B. 1991. Genetic variability and biochemical systematics of domestic and wild cat populations (*Felis silvestris*: Felidae). *Journal of Mammalogy*, **72**(1):79–88.

Shauenberg, P. 1969. L'identification du chat forestier d'Europe *Felis s. silvestris* Schreber 1777 par une méthode ostéométrique. *Revue Suisse de Zoologie*, **76**(2): 433–441.

Suminski, P. 1962. Les caractères de la forme pure du chat sauvage *Felis silvestris*, Schreber. *Archives des Sciences*, Genève, **15**(2): 277–296.

(4) Piotr Wyrost

Profesor Zwycz. Nauk Wet., pl. Grunwaldzki 17 m. 41, 50 378 Wroclaw, Poland

I have read with interest the application 'Proposed conservation of 15 mammal specific names ...'.

I completely agree with the proposals contained therein and support them wholly.

(5) Richard Schodde

Australian National Wildlife Collection, CSIRO Division of Wildlife and Ecology, P.O. Box 84, Lyneham, ACT 2602, Australia

With cordial respects to the proponents of this application, I am opposed to it for the following reasons:

1. In advocating validation of a set of junior names based on wild stock without rejection of senior names based on domestic stock of the same 'species', the proposal confounds the primal tenet of the Code, namely that the name of each taxon is unique and distinct (see the Preamble to the Code). It would create, in effect, pairs of alternative names for the same taxa, one for animals of wild origin and one for those of domestic origin. If these pairs are, indeed, taxonomically different (Kitchener's comment in BZN **53**: 194–196) then they may be distinguished nomenclaturally according to their assessed level of differentiation (species, subspecies) under existing provisions of the Code without invoking the plenary powers.

2. The proposal is incomplete insofar as it does not specify how the senior synonyms based on domestic stock are to be treated.

3. The proposal will create as much confusion as it resolves. My reading of support for it gives me the impression that it comes largely from a relatively small group of archeozoologists, and they may well feel comfortable with it. For vertebrate neontologists like myself, and the now very large world of ecologists, conservation biologists and wildlife managers, the proposal brings confusing complications that destabilize universality in zoological nomenclature. These biologists would not only have to learn the two sets of names but also understand how, when and where to apply them. That is nor often clear-cut.

4. The potential for destabilization is epitomised in feral animals. On one side they are derived from domestic stock and on the other re-approach wild stock in form and genetic structure through free out-breeding. So they blur the distinctions between domestic and wild, and some more than others. Where should the line be drawn nomenclaturally? Perhaps a third set of names would be advocated for ferals. So complication and confusion may escalate.

5. Further destabilization can arise from future proposals to extend paired wild stock/domestic stock nomenclature to other species beyond the 15 specified in the present proposal. This has already been foreshadowed by Gautier (BZN **53**: 194), exposing the proposal to some of the same criticisms that led to the lapsing of an earlier application to invalidate all names based on domestic stock.

6. Because of the precedents for future destabilization implicit in paras. 3, 4 and 5 above, I urge the Commission to rule against the present proposal.

7. In the interests of resolving the difficulties that archeozoologists have with the nomenclature for wild and domestic stock, I suggest the following solutions:

(a) if wild and domestic stock of a given lineage are taxonomically differentiated, carry out research to demonstrate the level of differentiation and then classify it at the appropriate nomenclatural level under existing provisions of the Code; and/or,

(b) adopt a system of distinction of the kind advocated by Odening (1979; see para. 5 of the application). That will provide a convention for separation, to which a system for ferals may be added, without contravening the principles of the Code.

(6) Walter J. Bock

Department of Biological Sciences, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027, U.S.A.

The problem described by Gentry, Clutton-Brock & Groves in the use of specific names for the set of 15 species of mammals possessing different names for domesticated and wild forms is a serious one indeed and should have been resolved long ago. A settlement of this problem must be obtained without delay. However, I feel that I must oppose the solution proposed in the application because it is at variance with the most basic tenet of zoological nomenclature. My reasons are as follows:

1. The request that the Commission use its plenary powers to rule that the name for each of the wild forms of these mammals mentioned in the proposal 'is not invalid by virtue of being antedated by a name based on a domestic form' is unclear. Does this request mean that the names proposed for the 'wild form' have precedence over those proposed for the 'domesticated forms'? If so, this should be stated clearly in the proposal. Or does this request mean, as I understand it does, that the name of the 'wild form' is to be valid, but without the name of the 'domesticated form' being invalid? If this is the case, then acceptance of the request in this application means that two valid names will exist for each of these 15 species of mammals. Hence, if the proposal is approved by the Commission, zoologists would be free to use either the name originally proposed for the 'domesticated form' or for the 'wild form' when dealing with a particular mammalian species taxon mentioned in the list (BZN **53**: 34).

2. If my understanding of the proposal is correct, it violates the principal canon of zoological nomenclature as stated in the Preamble of the Code, that the name for each taxon is unique and distinct, by proposing that there be alternative names for the same taxon depending on whether the worker is referring to the wild form or the domesticated form. This proposal does not specify how the senior synonyms based on domesticated forms are to be treated, and which name should be used if a zoologist considers the domesticated and the wild form to be members of the same species. One reading of the proposal is that the available names based on the wild form have precedence over those based on the domesticated form, but this is not made clear in the proposal. If this is the intention, I would be most unhappy to have a number of well-known names proposed by Linnaeus (1758) declared to lack precedence with respect to later names.

3. If mammalogists, archeozoologists and students of domesticated mammals consider the domesticated form to be a distinct taxon, either a species or a subspecies,

then names are available for these taxa. Which name is used for the species taxon and for the subspecies taxa for each mammal mentioned in the list should be decided on the basis of priority as there does not appear to be any foundation for a decision based on well-established usage.

4. This proposal and request to the Commission has the potential of creating considerable confusion and destabilization in nomenclature of these 15 species of mammals for zoologists, especially for the large number of ecologists, wildlife biologists and conservationists dealing with these species. These zoologists will have to learn two sets of names and rules for their use. Yet this application does not specify when either of the two available names should be used. And the decision on which name to use may not be at all clear in many cases, especially for feral populations or for populations for which it is not clear whether they are feral or wild. Moreover acceptance of the request presented in this proposal could well establish an unfortunate precedent for other names for animals based on 'wild' and 'domesticated' forms.

Because this proposal violates the most basic provision of the Code and because of its potential for future confusion and destabilization, I urge the Commission to rule against its requests. If the Commission so rules, then all zoologists dealing with these 15 species of mammals should be urged most strongly to use the proper valid name for these taxa based on priority.

(7) Alfred L. Gardner

U.S. Geological Survey-Biological Resources Division, National Museum of Natural History, Washington, D.C. 20560–0111, U.S.A.

I oppose the intent in the application by Gentry, Clutton-Brock & Groves to request the Commission to rule that 15 scientific names are 'not invalid by virtue of being antedated by a name based on a domestic form'. I have not examined the original descriptions of every one of these names to determine whether or not each is available, but for the present I presume they are. Therefore, if each name meets the criteria required in the Code, these names already are available and no action is necessary. Each of these names is valid if the worker using them believes the domestic and wild form represent separate species. Placing these 15 names on the Official List neither mandates nor guarantees their usage. The Commission cannot make rulings that are biological in nature. The three-part proposal (BZN 53: 33) will do nothing to solve the problem of inconsistent usage.

The central issue is a question of conspecificity; therefore, a biological one, not nomenclatural. Obviously, when a worker considers a domesticated form and its presumed progenitor to be conspecific, the senior synonym should be used. To do otherwise reveals either naivety on the part of the user, confusion about definition of biological species, or disregard for the rules of nomenclature. As stated, the editorial policy of Wilson & Reeder (1993) was to use the earliest available name for each taxon. Exceptions to that policy were oversights, a not too unlikely event considering the massive size of the work (xviii, 1206 pages). To castigate Wilson & Reeder for attempting to adhere to rules of nomenclature, even if they did deviate from 'majority usage', is to cast aspersions in the wrong direction. My personal opinion is that truly domesticated mammals in most cases are reproductively isolated from their wild progenitors and warrant species status. Occasional interbreeding between wild and domesticated stocks does not void separate species status; interspecific hybridization is common in nature (see, for example, Blair & Hubbs, 1961).

The Abstract of the application states: 'It is proposed that majority usage be confirmed by adoption of the first available specific name based on a wild population for the following wild taxa ... [15 names follow]'. Under para. 9 the authors state: '... we now propose that the usage for wild taxa of the first available names based on wild species should be conserved'. It appears to me that the authors intend by this application to direct the Commission to set aside all 15 senior names based on domesticates. Nevertheless, their proposals (para. 11 on BZN **53**: 33) fail to require such action. If the authors' application intends rejection of all names originally based on domestics, they should say so in their statement of proposals.

Clearly the intent of the proposal was to suppress availability of names based on domesticated mammals when names based on their wild progenitors are otherwise not used because they are junior synonyms. How would this impact on those names based on domestics that also are type species of their respective genera? I find it implausible that this solution to a 'problem' is touted as in the best interest of stability of nomenclature. Are not populations of domesticated mammals recognizable entities? I suggest that if Gentry, Clutton-Brock & Groves consider the coypu (*Myocastor coypus*; see para. 2 of the application) domesticated because the species is reared in captivity, they must also include ranched fox and mink. Also, what about gerbils, hamsters and chinchillas? Should the list of domesticates include *Homo sapiens*, which in the majority is surely by now domesticated? Last, but not least, the wild progenitor of the guinea pig (*Cavia porcellus*) may not be *C. aperea* but *C. tschudii*.

The following members of the Committee on Nomenclature of the American Society of Mammalogists support these comments: Mark S. Hafner, Clyde Jones, James L. Patton, Karl Koopman, Don E. Wilson.

Additional reference

Blair, W.F. & Hubbs, C. 1961. Biological species and phylogenetic taxonomy. *Systematic Zoology*, **10**: 42–43.

(8) Charles O. Handley, Jr.

Division of Mammals, MRC-108, National Museum of Natural History,
Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. 20560, U.S.A.

I do not support the intent of the proposal of Gentry, Clutton-Brock & Groves to conserve the usage of 15 specific names of wild mammals which are antedated by or are contemporary with names of domestic mammals. The problem cited by these authors is that: 'A number of systems have been devised for the naming of domestic animals but none has gained universal acceptance'. This is not surprising since there are no rules governing informal schemes which circumvent the Code. The Commission should not be concerned with such schemes or with proposals to make them respectable.

The Code provides an unequivocal basis for naming taxa and for applying the names to zoological entities. Fortunately it does not exclude some entities from classification and include others. It includes all zoological entities. The Code is intended to make the naming and classification of taxa almost automatic, entirely within the domain of taxonomists. It should be necessary for the Commission to intervene only when it seems that questions of nomenclature cannot be resolved by taxonomists adhering to the Code. Definition of species is a zoological problem which should be resolved by zoologists.

Some species of mammals have been more or less domesticated and consequently more or less altered morphologically from their wild ancestors. Domestication does not make a mammal any less of a zoological entity than it was before domestication. The question in simplest terms is: 'Has domestication altered the mammal to the species level or is it still conspecific with its wild ancestor?'. Whatever the answer, the oldest available properly formed name should be applied. In this instance it is inconceivable that any names could be more available than those of Linnaeus (1758)!

The question of rank of taxa is not unique to domesticated mammals. It is a question confronted by taxonomists every day in dealing with shrews, bats, rodents, and all other mammals. They marshal the data, make a determination, conspecific or not, and apply names, based on facts and interpretations. The process should be the same with domesticated mammals. They exist as zoological entities and they have nomenclaturally acceptable names. Zoologists should get on with the job of determining taxonomic rank and apply the oldest available name. Suppression of Linnaean names in favor of names decades or even more than a hundred years younger should not be considered as an option in dealing with the perceived problem of status of names of domestic mammals. All zoologists should abide by and support the Code.

(9) Anthea Gentry
Littlewood, Copyhold Lane, Cuckfield, Haywards Heath, West Sussex RH15 5EB, U.K.

Juliet Clutton-Brock
Working Group on Nomenclature, International Council of Archaeozoology,
c/o Department of Zoology, The Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road,
London SW7 5BD, U.K.

Colin P. Groves
Department of Archaeology and Anthropology, The Australian National University,
Canberra, A.C.T. 0200, Australia

It is clear from the four comments above (nos. 5–8) that the authors are misunderstanding and misinterpreting the purpose of our application. We wish to explain further and to put the matter straight.

There are very many wild species with domestic derivatives (several were listed in Corbet & Clutton-Brock, 1984). Of the names for these currently in use, the wild and domestic forms generally share the same name and in only a few cases are the names for the two forms traditionally distinct. There has been confusion in the literature in that, in most cases, names based on domestic forms, or encompassing both the wild and domestic forms, were published earlier (Linnaeus, 1758, 1766, and some other authors) than those for the wild taxa and some authors, disregarding majority usage, have applied them to wild species.

Our application seeks to solve this problem by conserving the first available names based on wild populations as the valid names *for the wild taxa*, whether or not the domestic forms are considered as 'conspecific', i.e. can be included in the same species. In a comment on this application (BZN 53: 193), Dr Gordon Corbet noted: 'Implementation of this proposal will stabilize the names of the wild species, while allowing freedom of taxonomic judgement as to what degree of domestication can be encompassed in the species-concept employed. This is particularly important in many archaeological studies where the ancestral wild species is usually not in doubt while the evidence of domestication is debatable'. Our application deals only with the names for wild taxa, and then only with the 15 names which by convention are distinct from, and predate or are contemporary with, those of their domestic derivatives, and is not concerned with the on-going discussion on the nomenclature of domestic animals.

Views differ on the 'conspecificity' of the wild and domestic forms. This is an entirely biological (or, more accurately, semantic) question. Whatever view is taken, domestic animals are, as Dr Alfred Gardner notes in his comment (no. 7 above), 'recognizable entities'. As a consequence they have vernacular names, but these are confined to individual languages and for universal scientific and other usage it is desirable that the latinized equivalents should not be disqualified on artificial grounds such as publication dates. For example, it is important for conservation reasons that the name *Ovis orientalis* for the Asian wild mouflon should not be submerged by *O. aries* (sheep), regardless of any view as to their 'conspecificity'.

Feral animals (mentioned by Dr Richard Schodde and Dr Walter Bock in their comments (5) and (6) above) are those that live in a self-sustained population in the wild after a history of domestication (see Clutton-Brock, 1992, p. 19). Names used are therefore those based on domestic forms: for example, *Ovis aries* for the European mouflon, *Canis familiaris* or *C. familiaris dingo* for the dingo (as cited in the Table in our application, BZN 53: 34) and *Canis familiaris* or *C. familiaris hallstromi* for the New Guinea singing dog. Similarly, the name *Oryctolagus cuniculus* applies to the western Mediterranean wild rabbit and the almost world-wide feral rabbit.

It is not only in archaeology, where the distinction between wild species and domestic forms and intermediate stages is crucial, that the clear and unambiguous separation of the names for wild and domestic forms is desirable and beneficial (cf. comments by Dr Schodde and Dr Bock, nos. (5) and (6) above). Zoologists in the broadest sense have followed this approach. So far there have been 31 comments in support of our application, received from authors working in extant zoology, palaeontology, conservation, endangered species management, ethology and specimen curation, as well as in archaeology (see BZN 53: 125, 192–200, 286–288, and comments (1)–(4) above). In conservation legal documentation is an issue, and in the most recent publication (1966) issued by the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) names based on wild species have been used for protected wild taxa. To switch now to names based on domestic forms would be illogical and would bring not only enormous and prolonged confusion but potentially serious consequences.

As noted above, our current application deals only with the names for wild taxa and we have made no proposals for a standard way of naming domestic animals. There are several systems currently in use, some of which are mentioned in the case, others were included in Groves's (1971) application and in Gautier (1993); see the comment by Dr Henry Gee (BZN **53**: 288). Contrary to Dr Gardner's and Dr Handley's suppositions (comments (7) and (8) above), we have not proposed, and we emphasize that it is not our intention, that names based on domestic forms should be suppressed. Indeed, notational systems of nomenclature for domestic forms such as those proposed by Bohlken (1958, 1961), Dennler de la Tour (1959, 1968) and Odening (1979) are not in accord with the Code (paras. 4 and 5 of the application) and their use should not be encouraged.

Additional references

Clutton-Brock, J. 1992. *Horse power: a history of the horse and donkey in human societies.* Natural History Museum Publications & Harvard University Press.

World Conservation Monitoring Centre. 1996. *Checklist of CITES Species. A reference to the appendices to the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora.* 400 pp. CITES Secretariat & World Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge, U.K.